

-11-

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to Claims 9 and 28 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but also indicated that such claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner is thanked for such allowable subject matter. In response, applicant has amended such claims in the recommended fashion.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 17-20, 22-29, and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Wesinger, Jr. et al. (USPN 6,052,788). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove.

For example, the Examiner has relied on the following excerpt from Wesinger to meet applicant's claimed "looking up the domain name in the access control list" (see this or similar, but not identical subject matter in each of the independent claims).

"When a client needs a particular piece of information (e.g., the IP address of homer.odyssey.com), it asks its local DNS server for that information. The local DNS server first examines its own local memory, such as a cache, to see if it already knows the answer to the client's query." (col. 7, lines 54-57)

The Examiner continues by arguing that "such as local DNS server first examines its own local memory." Applicant respectfully disagrees with such assertion. In Wesinger, the DNS server checks its local memory for "a particular piece of information (e.g., the IP address of homer.odyssey.com)." Such IP address in no way meets applicant's claimed "access control list."

Further, the Examiner has relied on the following excerpt from Wesinger to meet applicant's claimed "sending to the client a reply containing the IP address of the domain name if the client is authorized in the access control list to receive the IP address, and

-12-

denying said request if the client is not authorized to receive the IP address" (see this or similar, but not identical subject matter in each of the independent claims).

"The foregoing discussion has focused on the programmable transparency aspects of the present firewall. Of course, a primary function of a firewall is to selectively allow and disallow communications. Hence, in the course of establishing a connection, each virtual host examines a configuration table to determine, based on the particulars of the requested connection-- source, destination, protocol, time-of-day, port number, etc.-- whether such a connection will be allowed or disallowed." (col. 9, lines 6-14)

Applicant respectfully disagrees. In the foregoing excerpt, a firewall is disclosed which conditionally allows communications based on a source, etc. This conditional allowance of communications simply does not rise to the level of specificity of applicant's claimed conditional sending to the client a reply containing the IP address of the domain name. Further, simply allowing communications based on a source, etc. does not meet applicant's specifically claimed condition, namely if the client is not authorized to receive the IP address.

Only applicant teaches and claims the determination as to whether a client is authorized to receive a particular IP address, and the conditional sending of the claimed reply based on such determination.

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

-13-

This criterion has simply not been met by the Wesinger reference. Nevertheless, despite the foregoing paramount differences and in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of the present application, applicant has amended each of the independent claims as follows:

“looking up the domain name in the access control list, wherein the access control list specifies clients approved to receive an IP address corresponding to a domain name of a target host, and the access control list is accessed by the DNS server” (see this or similar, but not identical subject matter in each of the independent claims).

Again, the table of Wesinger merely tracks source, destination, protocol, time-of-day, port number, etc. information using a configuration table that is accessed by a firewall. There is simply no access control list, as now specifically claimed by applicant, that is specifically used by a DNS server. It should be noted that the “transparent mapping” of Wesinger is merely included for providing programmable transparency and dynamically mapping remote hosts to virtual hosts. Wesinger merely provides a general description of a DNS server in col. 7 thereof, but does not even suggest a DNS server that meets applicant’s claim limitations.

A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has further rejected Claims 6, 7, 16, 17, 21, 30, 31, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wesinger, Jr. et al. (USPN 6,052,788) and further in view of Green et al. (USPN 6,003,084) Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, since such claims depend on claims which are now deemed allowable in view of the remarks made hereinabove.

To this end, all of the pending independent claims are deemed allowable, along with any dependent claims dependent therefrom.

-14-

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. Applicants are enclosing a check to pay for the added claims. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P316).

Respectfully submitted,
Zilka-Kotab, PC

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
408-505-5100